

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,259	09/10/2003	Hitoshi Sato	953.1010	4011
21171 75	90 06/03/2004		EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			TRAN, DIEM T	
SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			3748	-
			DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summer	10/658,259	SATO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Diem Tran	3748				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	action is non-final.					
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	* * *	· ·				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1, 2, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Kuenstler et al. (JP 2002-195086).

Regarding claims 1, 2, Kuenstler discloses an internal combustion engine exhaust gas purifying system having a continuous regenerating diesel particulate filter system on the exhaust passage of an internal combustion engine to oxidize and remove collected particulate matter by performing the regenerating-mode operation when the quantity of collected particulate matter in a filter of the filter system for collecting the particulate matter becomes a predetermined judgment value or more, comprising:

collected-quantity estimation means for estimating the quantity of collected particulate matter in the filter (see translation, page 4, part [0028]); and maximum-fuel-injection-quantity restricting means for restricting the maximum fuel injection quantity of the internal combustion engine when the quantity of collected particulate matter estimated by the collected-quantity estimation means is the predetermined judgment value or more (see abstract, see translation, page 4, parts [0032], [0033], page 5, parts [0038], [0039]).

Art Unit: 3748

Regarding claim 4, Kuenstler further discloses that the continuous regenerating diesel particulate filter system uses a system constituted by setting an oxidation catalyst (9) to the upstream side of the filter (10) (see Figure 1).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuenstler et al. (JP 2002-195086) in view of Sato et al. (US Patent 4,535,588).

Regarding claim 3, Kuenstler discloses all the claimed limitations as discussed in claim 1 above, however, fails to disclose that the collected-quantity estimation means estimates the quantity of collected particulate matter in accordance with the differential pressure between the upstream and downstream of the filter. Sato teaches that it is conventional in the art, to estimate the quantity of collected particulate matter in accordance with the differential pressure between the upstream and downstream of the filter (se col. 5, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized the teaching of Sato in the Kuenstler device, since the use thereof would have provided a means for initiating the regeneration of the filter.

Art Unit: 3748

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Diem Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-6073. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Friday from 8:00 a.m.- 5:30p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas E. Denion, can be reached on (703) 308-2623. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.

Diem Tran

Patent Examiner

Rendran

Art unit 3748

DT May 28, 2004

THOMAS DENION

Page 4

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700